



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,922	07/30/2001	Roger Paulman	11362/14	6577

7590 06/02/2004
William F. Prendergast
Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

DUONG, THO V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3743

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/918,922	Applicant(s) PAULMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Tho v Duong	Art Unit 3743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it should avoid using phrases, which can be implied, such as "are also disclosed". Furthermore, since this application claimed an apparatus of a heat exchanger tube, the applicant should re-write the abstract because the abstract should reflect only the invention claimed in this divisional application. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: the reference number (20A) is described in the specification (page 9, line 8). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3743

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3 and 4 recite the limitation "the one or more collapsed sidewall" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zifferer (US 5,311,661). Zifferer discloses (figures 9-11) a heat exchanger tube (14) having first and second ends (15) and an internal passageway extending between the first and second end; the elongated tube (14) having at least two collapsed side wall portions extending substantially the length of the tube; the two collapsed side wall portions comprises a pair of opposing elongated recesses extending substantially the length of the heat exchanger tube wherein each of the recesses has a U-shaped configuration having two sides and a bottom, and wherein the bottom of the U-shaped configurations of the at least two collapsed portions contact each other. Zifferer further discloses (column 4, lines 20-25) that the tube has a thickness of 0.02 inches. As regarding limitation of "For use in the heat exchanger...at least one fin set", it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not

Art Unit: 3743

differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). As regarding the limitation of “adapted to”, it has been held that the recitation that an element is “adapted to” perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. In re Hutchison, 69 USPQ 138. In this case the tubes (14) is made of metal such as copper or aluminum which is a ductile material, the metal tube has an ability to be bent to form any shape which includes a bent portion and engage to secure the tube to any passage of a fin set. Furthermore, since the collapsed sidewall portion as shown by Zifferer, are not welded or bonded together, the tube has an ability to be expanded radially outwardly until the collapsed sidewall portions are no longer contact each other.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Thomson-Houston Company (GB 543,018) discloses a heat exchanger that has two collapsed sidewalls in contact with one another.

F. W. French et al. (US 1,916,474) discloses a copper and copper alloy tube and a method of making the tube.

D. F. Grimm (US 3,173,196) discloses a method of producing a double walled tube with one of the tubes having integral projected fin.

R. C. Jones (US 1,549,489) discloses an oil cooler that has tube with collapsed sidewall portions.

Stokes et al. (US 5,167,275) discloses a heat exchanger tube with turbulator.

Art Unit: 3743

Kent et al. (US 5,604,982) discloses a method for mechanically expanding elliptical tubes.

Hatada et al. (US 4,365,667) discloses a heat exchanger that has bent portion and fin sets.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Tho Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0768. The examiner can normally be reached on from 9:30-6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennet, can be reached on (703) 308-0101. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.



TD

May 26, 2004



Tho Duong

Patent Examiner.